

**REMARKS**

The present amendment is made as a result of the realization that the Examiner had not demonstrated that the Turau reference is prior art -- and accordingly that the claims had been improvidently narrowed. The amendment returns the claims to their original scope. Any remaining changes to the claims are purely formal in nature and do not affect the scope of the claims.

It should be noted that the prior arguments submitted in response to the art rejections have not been rendered entirely moot, because the limitations formerly added to the independent claims relating to annotated DTD's -- and which are relevant to the Bray reference -- are still applicable to some of the reinstated dependent claims, for instance 90-92, 94 and 96.

Since the prior communications under rule 116 were not amendments, this is actually the first amendment submitted under rule 116.

Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment does not require further consideration because the Examiner has already searched these claims. Entry is accordingly proper and is respectfully requested.

In any case, in view of the fact that the Examiner has failed to demonstrate that Turau is prior art, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner should withdraw the finality of the office action and issue a new office action. This amendment can therefore be entered before the new office action.

Applicants intend to provide a declaration under rule 131 against the eventuality that the Examiner can prove the reference to be prior art. This declaration will be submitted under separate cover.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

21

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 50-0510. Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

Respectfully submitted by,

*Anne E. Barschall*

Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089  
914-332-1019; fax 914-332-7719  
May 13, 2004